



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/802,401

03/17/2004

Achim Hartlaub

82448

3701

22242 7590 05/03/2007  
FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY  
120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET  
SUITE 1600  
CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406

EXAMINER

LUONG, VINH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3682

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/03/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                          |                                      |  |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/802,401 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>HARTLAUB ET AL. |  |
|                          | <b>Examiner</b><br>Vinh T. Luong     | <b>Art Unit</b><br>3682                |  |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Vinh T. Luong. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Stephen Favakeh. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 30 April 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 16 and 19.

Identification of prior art discussed: Miyako et al. (Pub. No. 2002/0033321 A1).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Vinh T. Luong  
Primary Examiner



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant contended that the first portion of the holding part 21 of Miyako is press-fitted to the foam 22, thus, the foam material does not provide the only holding force between the holding part and the steering wheel skeleton. The Examiner set forth that the "wherein" clause in claim 19 recites the inherent results of the structures recited in claims 16 and 19, thus, it does not add to the claim's patentability or substance over Miyako. The Examiner respectfully suggested to amend claim 19 to positively recite the patentable distinguishing structure(s) over Miyako reference.



Vinh T. Luong  
Primary Examiner